Northern District of California

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

ELROY PEDRO GOMEZ,

Petitioner,

v.

WILLIAM "JOE" SULLIVAN,

Respondent.

Case No. <u>19-cv-06129-SI</u>

ORDER EXTENDING DEADLINE TO FILE NOTICE OF APPEAL AND DENYING CERTIFICATE OF **APPEALABILITY**

Re: Dkt. Nos. 22, 23

The pro se petitioner has filed a request for an extension of the deadline to file a notice of appeal from the October 16, 2020 order denying petition for writ of habeas corpus. The request is GRANTED. Docket Nos. 22, 23. Petitioner must file a notice of appeal from that order no later than **fourteen days** from the date of this order. That deadline will not be extended for any reason. See Fed. R. App. P. 4(a)(5)(C).

The pro se petitioner's request for a certificate of appealability is DENIED. Docket Nos. 22, 23. A certificate of appealability, see 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c), will not issue as to the October 16, 2020 order denying petition for writ of habeas corpus because this is not a case in which "reasonable jurists would find the district court's assessment of the constitutional claims debatable or wrong." Slack v. McDaniel, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000). A certificate of appealability will not issue as to the October 20, 2020 order denying appointment of counsel because this is not a case in which "jurists of reason would find it debatable whether the petition states a valid claim of the denial of a constitutional right and that jurists of reason would find it debatable whether the district court was correct in its procedural [ruling]" in that order. *Id.* The denial of the certificate of appealability is without prejudice to petitioner seeking a certificate from the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit. No further motions should be filed in the district court.

Case 3:19-cv-06129-SI Document 24 Filed 12/18/20 Page 2 of 2

United States District Court Northern District of California The record is somewhat confused as to whether attorney Such is now representing petitioner or petitioner is proceeding *pro se*. *Compare* Docket No. 18 (attorney Such listed as counsel) *with* Docket Nos. 22 and 23 (documents filed *pro se*). Out of an abundance of caution, the clerk will send a copy of this order to both petitioner (in prison) and attorney Such, as well as to counsel for respondent.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: December 18, 2020

SUSAN ILLSTON

United States District Judge